

Remarks

Claims 1-19 are presently pending. Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 recites, among other limitations, “processing a first subset of the encoded symbols to identify a second subset of the encoded symbols, where each encoded symbol in the second subset uses a common coding context, wherein the coding context indicates a probability for a plurality of possible symbols”. Claim 7 recites, among other limitations, “encoding a first subset of the symbols to identify a second subset of the symbols, where each symbol in the second subset uses a common coding context, wherein said coding context indicates a probability for a plurality of possible symbols”.

Examiner has indicated that Yoshimura teaches “contemporaneously processing a first subset of the encoded symbols to identify a second subset of the encoded symbols”. Assignee respectfully traverses. Even if Examiner is correct that in Yoshimura, “the data from a stream of video data is received, wherein the stream of video data comprises a plurality of group of frames (GOPs), a group of frames comprises a plurality of individual frames, ie., I, P and B frames, where the frames (I, P and B) are encoded with subsets of encoded symbols, wherein fig. 3 and 10, the use of binary code is the common context used to process the encoded symbols”, Office Action at 7, Yoshimura does not teach “processing a first subset of the encoded symbols *to identify a second subset of the encoded symbols*”. It is noted that neither the first subset of the encoded symbols or the second subset of encoded symbols are identified by Examiner. Should Examiner maintain this rejection, Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner identify the particular symbols that are deemed the first subset and which particular symbols are deemed the second subset. Although Examiner has indicated that “frames (I, P, and B) are encoded with subsets of encoded symbols”, Yoshimura does not teach “processing” of “a first subset of the encoded symbols” to “identify a second subset”. Accordingly, for this reason alone, Assignee traverses the rejection to claim 1 and 7.

Accordingly, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection to claims 1 and 7, as well as to dependent claims 2-6, and 8-19.

Additionally, claim 7 is amended to recite, among other limitations, “contemporaneously encoding a first subset of the symbols to identify a second subset of the symbols, where each

symbol in the second subset uses a common encoding context, wherein said encoding context indicates a probability for a plurality of possible symbols”.

Assignee respectfully submit that Yoshimura in view of Hata does not teach the foregoing. Examiner has indicated that “Yoshimura does not specifically disclose wherein the coding context ... indicates a probability of possible symbols.” Moreover, Hata teaches “It is noted that Hata describes “An apparatus and method of decoding ...”. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully submits that the combination does not teach “wherein said *encoding* context indicates a probability for a plurality of possible symbols”.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, each of the pending claims are in a condition for allowance. Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issuance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees for actions requested herein to account no. 13-0017.

September 30, 2008

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison – Suite 3400
Chicago, IL 60661

Phone (312) 775-8000
FAX (312) 775-8100

Respectfully Submitted



Mirut Dalal
Attorney for Assignee
Reg. No. 44,052